

REMARKS

The Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for his quick reply to the After Final response filed heretofore. The Applicant has filed a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and amended a number of claims that the Applicant believes are distinguished over the cited references for the following reasons.

The Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8 and 15 to more clearly describe the invention. For example, claim 1 (as amended) recites,

A method of adaptively connecting a video source and a video display, comprising:

- (a) connecting a video source interface to a video display interface with a signal cable;
- (b) automatically determining whether the video source is an analog video source or a digital video source;
- (c) automatically determining whether the video display is an analog video display or a digital video display; and
- (d) configuring the video source interface and the video display interface based on (b) and (c).

In this way, the invention as recited in claim 1 teaches that the video source and the video display interfaces are configured based upon the nature (i.e., analog or digital) of both the video source and the video display. In contrast, Kim teaches determining which type DVI connector (DVI-I or DVI-A) is already connected to the digital display. At no point does Kim teach or even remotely suggest that the DVI connector itself (be it an I type or an A type) is reconfigured in any manner let alone reconfigured based upon the nature of both the video source and the video display (such as a DVI-I connector being configured as a DVI-I connector, or vice versa). To reiterate, Kim merely ascertains which type DVI connector is already present and nothing more. ("As described above, the apparatus and method according to the present invention detect the kind of the DVI connector connected to the digital video display device." at column 9, lines 39 -41).

Therefore, the Applicant believes that claim 1 as currently pending is not taught or suggested by Kim or Clark (previously discussed) and request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections thereof.

Independent claims 8 and 15 have been amended to recite essentially the same limitations as claim 1 and are therefore also believed to be allowable.

All remaining dependent claims depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 8 and 15 and are also believed to be allowable.

Therefore, the Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Michael J. Ferrazano
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300